

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 63%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 60.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 63%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 5.4%.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 18.25%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 24%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97% for reading and 97% for math.</p> <p>These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data for reading and math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 29.02% for reading and 29.9% for math. The State's FFY 2006 reported data were 29% for reading and 30.5% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 45% for reading and 40% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the definition of significant discrepancy and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.18%. Because the State revised the definition of significant discrepancy, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected PEAs to revise), the PEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the PEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006 and FFY 2007.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the results of the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the PEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006. The State provided that information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 through the</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the results of the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.	LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)																				
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																				
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td><td>Progress</td></tr><tr><td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td><td>52.3</td><td>55</td><td>51</td><td>2.70%</td></tr><tr><td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td><td>16.2</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>1.20%</td></tr><tr><td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td><td>2.7</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.3</td><td>0.20%</td></tr></table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data for 5A, 5B and 5C.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	52.3	55	51	2.70%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.2	15	16	1.20%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.7	2.5	2.3	0.20%	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	52.3	55	51	2.70%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.2	15	16	1.20%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.7	2.5	2.3	0.20%																		

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
	for 5C.																									
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010.																								
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table><tr><th>07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th><th>Social Emotional</th><th>Knowledge & Skills</th><th>Appropriate Behavior</th></tr><tr><td>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td><td>13.42</td><td>16.16</td><td>14.96</td></tr><tr><td>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>33.12</td><td>37.70</td><td>32.55</td></tr><tr><td>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td><td>32.25</td><td>30.65</td><td>31.23</td></tr><tr><td>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>20.48</td><td>14.75</td><td>20.83</td></tr><tr><td>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>.71</td><td>.71</td><td>.41</td></tr></table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	13.42	16.16	14.96	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	33.12	37.70	32.55	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	32.25	30.65	31.23	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	20.48	14.75	20.83	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	.71	.71	.41	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	13.42	16.16	14.96																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	33.12	37.70	32.55																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	32.25	30.65	31.23																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	20.48	14.75	20.83																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	.71	.71	.41																							

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Total (approx. 100%)	99.98%	99.97%	99.98%		
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 48.2%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 46% for this indicator. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.					In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State’s population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation and its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its definition of disproportionate representation. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, revisions to its procedures under this indicator to ensure that the State provides for an annual determination of whether any disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification consistent with 34 CFR §§300.173 and 300.600(d)(3), including revisions to address appropriate reviews of policies, procedures and practices. The State provided that information. The State reported that no PEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State’s calculation of the data.					OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation and its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.35%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its definition of disproportionate representation. The State did not					The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR,

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, revisions to its procedures under this indicator to ensure that the State provides for an annual determination of whether any disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification consistent with 34 CFR §§300.173 and 300.600(d)(3), including revisions to address appropriate reviews of policies, procedures and practices. The State provided that information.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of PEAs determined in FFY 2007 and FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 of 13 PEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it continues to monitor the correction of the PEA's practices through on-site visits, file reviews, desk audits, and phone and email communication; and resources have been provided to school personnel. Additional actions taken include the interruption of IDEA payments and the assignment of a special monitor.</p>	<p>due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.</p>
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84%.</p>	<p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and 2006 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 19 of 35 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by the date of submission of the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR that the remaining FFY 2005 noncompliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected within 27 months of identification of the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 82.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP was developed and implemented. The State reported in the APR that "ADE/ECSE's data system failed and did not collect the range of days beyond the timeline and that the problem has been addressed and the data system will gather this information during the next data collection period."</p>	<p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining two LEAs with uncorrected noncompliance findings were corrected.</p> <p>The State must include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, data consistent with the instructions regarding the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP was</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that 66 of 72 PEAs with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that four of six remaining PEAs with findings of noncompliance were subsequently corrected and the PEAs with uncorrected findings had the “Part B 619 funds” interrupted. The PEAs are required to submit monthly reports for Indicator 12 data until 100% compliance is reached and the ADE/ECSE provides technical assistance to bring the PEAs toward compliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR that the FFY 2005 noncompliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>developed and implemented.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 61%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 57.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 67 of 75 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by the date of submission of the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR that the remaining FFY 2005</p>	<p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. Therefore, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>noncompliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected within 25 months of identification of the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s); and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case of noncompliance, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 57.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 71.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 71.8% for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 93.2%. The reported data for FFY 2006 were 93.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 1713 of 1838 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that an additional 78 findings were subsequently corrected within 13 to 25 months from the date of identification. The State further reported that the remaining 28 findings of noncompliance were identified in one PEA, and that for this PEA, IDEA</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>payments were interrupted and a special monitor assigned.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005 for this indicator. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP's 09-02 Memo.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	process resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that 15 of 22 resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 68.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 72.7%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 63%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 70.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 73.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 83%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95%. OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) a copy of the relevant statutory provision regarding the 2006 changes to "the issue of PEAs being able to amend the SAIS [student accountability information system] data for three years; (2) clarification of whether downward revisions are allowed; (3) the time period for such revisions; and (4) the impact, if any, on the validity and reliability of such revisions on the State's data. The State provided that information.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.